DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 233 RC 006 338

AUTHOR Schwarzweller, Harry K.; Brown, James S.
TITLE Social Structure of the Contact Situation: Rural Appalachia and Urban America. Appalachian Center Information Report 1.
INSTITUTION West Virginia Univ., Morgantown.
REPORT NO WVU-Bull-S-69-12-6
PUB DATE Jun 69
NOTE 9p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Area Studies; Church Role; *Community Development; Cultural Interrelationships; Family Influence; Family Structure; Institutions; Mass Media; Migrants; Rural Economics; *Rural Education; Rural Urban Differences; *Social Structure; *Socioeconomic Influences
IDENTIFIERS *Appalachia

ABSTRACT

An investigation of the characteristic structuring of rural communities in Appalachia and the institutional channels for change which exist within such communities comprise this revised version of a paper read at the Extension Leaders Conference, Morgantown, West Virginia, 1968. Specifically, this essay discusses how education, the mass media, religious institutions, the local governmental structure, the economic contact between urban America and rural agricultural communities, and the contact structure between outer and inner educational systems in Appalachia attempt to integrate rural and urban subcultures. Emphasis is placed on the communication and linkage between these analytically distinct systems and how the nature of that contact situation affects an articulation of the regional community and national sociocultural systems so that they function as a single system. Two main inferences emerge in the conclusion: (1) that a heavy investment of societal resources in the educational institutions at the elementary and secondary level would be a most effective strategy for securing the well-being of the Appalachian people, and (2) that agencies, such as the Extension Service or Programs of Adult Education, and organizations, such as the Community College System and Teacher Training Schools, should become more cognizant of the supportive role they play in strengthening the linkages between rural Appalachian communities and modern, rural America. (HBC)

social structure of the contact situation: rural appalachia and urban america[1]

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NMSU

Harry K. Schwarzweller, Professor of Sociology, West Virginia University
James S. Brown, Professor of Sociology, University of Kentucky

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY BULLETIN
Series 69 No. 12-6 June 1969
Second Class postage paid at
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

APPALACHIAN CENTER
INFORMATION REPORT 1
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

Contemporary Appalachia is predominantly a rural society in transition.[2] We may consider it transitional in the sense that social change forces which have induced and are inducing qualitative changes in the very fabric of that society (i.e., structural changes) have not as yet affected a relatively stable "new structure," though a new structure can be foreseen as an inevitable consequence of those change forces.[3] To be sure, the economy of the region continues to be dominated by the extractive or primary industries — agriculture, mining, forestry.[4] A sizeable proportion of the labor force is still engaged in subsistence farming, marginal coal mining, and various unskilled occupational pursuits.[5] An appallingly large segment of the population continues to live in abject poverty in mountain neighborhoods and rural slums whose conditions defy the comprehension of sympathetic and reasonable observers from more affluent states and from foreign lands.[6] Nevertheless, there are unmistakable signs supported by impressive evidence that the region is gradually becoming industrialized,[7] that the once traditional rural society and folk culture is steadily becoming urbanized, and that Appalachia is certainly on the way toward modernization at a rate which by any measure must be called "a great leap forward" — into the mainstream of American Society and into the flurry of the Twentieth Century.

This blending and integration of rural and urban subcultures, not only in the Appalachian case but also in many other parts of the contemporary world, is a notable social phenomenon of our time and has received, and deserves, much attention. For, as we can readily appreciate from personal experiences and from an understanding of the sources of conflict and tension on the international scene, the processes of societal reorganization affect the very foundations of social order and, consequently, the well-being, life organization and personal stability of individuals and families who are caught-up in that swirl of change.

We have chosen to direct attention toward one aspect of the larger problem. Our aim, in this brief essay, is to explore at a somewhat abstract level the characteristic structuring of rural communities in Appalachia and the institutional channels for change which exist within such communities. Specifically, we are concerned with those institutional complexes which, through communication, linkage, and cultural diffusion, connect (or span the gap between) relatively isolated rural communities of Appalachia with mainstream America. In other words, we wish to examine the "normal" instrumentalities for change which are woven into the social fabric of community life and which, over time, tend to bring mountain life and culture into congruence with the norms and behavior patterns of urban America.[8]

Education is one such instutional complex. In a very broad sense, education refers to the total socialization process by which a society trains its young and retrains its old. In a narrower sense, education refers to the formalized extrafamilial soceial mechanisms within a society for the transmission of culture and for the introduction of new (and presumably more modern) patterns of behavior and thought to the young, primarily, but also to the adult generation.[9] The principal extrafamilial social mechanism in American society, which indeed has a virtual monopoly over this function, is the community school. However, we must recognize that there are other social mechanisms, such as, for example, the Extension Service and the mass media,

1006338

which perform complementary functions, bolstering the effectiveness of the community school in reaching young people, and supplementary functions, confronting the adult population with new ideas and, in effect, instigating change. Furthermore, the educational system of a society, whether through the schools or through other mechanisms such as the Extension Service and mass media, not only transmits culture from one generation to another, over time, but also is a unifying and homogenizing cultural force that is influential in spatially welding together previously distinct ways of life.[10] In short, education has played and is playing a considerable part in bringing about the great sociocultural changes occurring in relatively isolated rural areas of the United States such as Appalachia.

At this point, it may be noted, we have been anticipating our conclusions. Let us reserve further speculation about these and about their implications for programs of change in Appalachia until we have had an opportunity to explore the social structure of the contact situation between the relatively isolated rural communities of Appalachia and urban America.

Our attention, then, is centered on the communication and linkage between these analytically distinct systems and how the nature of that contact situation affects an articulation (coming together) of the regional community and national sociocultural systems so that they function as a single system.[11] The point we intend to develop is that the modernizing forces of urban America tend to gain entree into the mountain culture through the educational system, and because of the structure of the contact situation itself the other basic institutional systems within the communities of this predominantly rural region tend to be more or less insular and insulated from direct integrative communication and linkage with mainstream America.[12]

Rural Appalachia, in many respects, is a familistic society in which "all the social relationships and institutions are permeated by and stamped with the characteristics of the family."[13] This orientation, supported by other orientations in the mountain ethos such as traditionalism and puritanism, is perpetuated in many ways by the institutions of this society. The most important way is the family's almost monopolistic role in the early socialization of children.[14]

Structurally, from the viewpoint of the community, the family institution is decentralized or multicentered. Each kinship unit tends to be a more or less closed social system with membership ascriptively assigned. Individuals rely heavily upon the family group for satisfying essential as well as most secondary, (i.e., derived) needs and, relatively speaking, the mountaineer — especially those in the subsistence farming areas — experiences very little active engagement with the larger society other than through the kin network. To be sure, as an integral part of a close-knit family group, the individual has a place in the scheme of things — a haven of safety. Yet, viewed from another perspective it might be said that he is caught up in a web of familism. To the extent that his family group is isolated from the mainstream of American Society and from the changing thoughtways of the modern world, the individual, too, is cut-off from the outside and restricted in his world view. And that is often the case. Inter-family linkage, for example, through linkage of family members with other sub-systems in the community is generally limited and weak. Formal organizations occupy a very small part of the social life in mountain communities[15] and any change-promoting program such as that offered by the Extension Service has a difficult, almost impossible, task of implementing that program if it relies only on communication through formal organizations. Neighboring, too, is largely a family affair and the informal relationships, the mutual aid and resulting network of reciprocal obligations, and the leadership structure which evolve within the mountain locality are subject to the careful scrutiny, biased appraisal, and constant vigilance of the family group.

Mass media would seem to provide a tremendously persuasive direct entree by the national culture into the insular family systems of these mountain communities. Yet by its very nature this contact is specialized, impersonal, concerned more with things than with ideas, more with ends than means, and only indirectly with the normative structure of the insular family system. Mass media effect a partial or weak linkage, attaining communicative meaning only after being strained through the sieve of the valued interests of the familistic society. On this point, for example, H. H. Remmers concludes from his

study of the early socialization of attitudes that "The individual's need to retain his attitudes intact and thus to minimize conflicts and disagreements with persons in his social environment entail to a marked degree selective perception and a kind of self-insulation against conflicting and therefore disturbing attitudes. It is a well-known fact that people tend strongly to read those newspapers and to listen to those news commentators who most support their own attitudes.""[16]

Furthermore, rural low-income families in Appalachia do not have as much contact with mass communication media as one might perhaps suppose. For example, a recent study of famlies participating in a program of Aid to Fameilies with Dependent Children and Unemployed Parents in seven eastern Kentucky counties found that: "Over four-fifths of the families had no member who reads a newspaper regularly, half of the families seldom or never saw television, and a third had no radio. Most of the few newspapers read were l o c a l county weeklies — the radio stations they reported listening to were almost exclusively local eastern Kentucky ones. While one might expect each family to be reached by at least one of the media, this was not the case, for a fifth had no newspaper, radio, T.V., nor anyone in the family who regularly viewed T.V.""[17]

It may be that the most significant direct linkage between urban America and the insular family systems of Appalachia comes through the tremendous numbers of migrants who maintain ties with their families "back home." Only insofar as these migrants, however, assimilate and substitute urban norms and behavioral characteristics for those of the "mountain" way of life, and only insofar as this personality change becomes communicatively effective with the family "back home" can this linkage be influential in bringing about a sociocultural integration of the rural and urban family systems. We know, however, from a number of studies on migration,[18] that Appalachian migrants themselves tend to be isolated within migrant neighborhoods in and around the major metropolitan areas and therefore, for this and other reasons, the assimilation of urban norms is a slow process. Also, their effectiveness as advocates of change is limited by their specified status and role positions within the family group; because they are generally young, their power to suggest innovations is somewhat restricted within a mountain culture that continues to emphasize a high regard for age.

Religious institutions in Appalachia, because of their nature and structure, tend to be insulated from those of urban America. This is not to say, of course, that there is no linkage. However, the line of communication between the churches in rural Appalachian communities and the "outside" is notably indirect, not strong, and not continuous.

Rural Appalachian people are overwhelmingly Protestant. The dominant mountain religious traditions emphasize congregational autonomy, which weakens ties with the outside and reinforces the localistic orientation common to much of the region's institutional structure. Furthermore, the general religious orientation strongly emphasizes direct personal relationships between the individual and his God to such an extent that great social pressure is put upon **each** individual to establish such a relationship. Indeed, most Southern Highlanders believe that an individual has the inherent right, freedom and privilege to choose for himself in matters of religion and that, rather than family tradition, an individual's preferences, beliefs and interpretation of the Bible should be basis for his convictions and choice.[19] This stress, coupled with the low socioeconomic and educational levels always characteristic of the region, has tended to make mountain religion more emotional, more fundamentalistic, more personal, and more familistic than urban America's religion. It is no surprise, then, to find scores of "splinter" groups or sects, few highly formalized church organizations, and consequently very low numbers of church members reported in religious censuses. Most mountain churches are small and informally structured, having relatively few services.[20] The ministers of these churches are usually local men, frequently "Sunday preachers" who earn most of their livelihood in other occupations, often serving more than one church group. Seldom are they well educated. The family, in this rural society, fulfills more of the religious function than is true in the urban American society. Thus, by its very nature and structure, religion tends **not** to be an effective, close institutional link between the relatively isolated rural communities of Appalachia and urban America.

It is useful, we believe, to think of the political institution of mountain communities as two systems. On the one hand, there is the hierarchical governing structure of the community, and on the other hand there is the system of state and federal agencies operating within the community.

Local governmental structure is patterned according to state and national prescription, licensed by and administratively tied to the legal system of American Society, but with its operative roots, so to speak, in community mores and tradition. Selection of individuals to staff positions in this structure is largely a local matter, very often a process of distributing tribute to those who reflect valued personality traits associated with "political jobs" or who represent segmental groups in control of the local balance of power. In the process of filling these positions, as in the process of law enforcement within mountain communities, kinship relationships are not ignored.[21]

The system of governmental agencies maintained and sponsored by the Federal Government within the rural community is, of course, a direct linkage between the inner and outer systems through such programs as acreage control, the Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, various regulatory agencies, social security, taxation, and, of course, the various agencies associated with the Federally-financed poverty programs. Most of these agencies, however, have economic or limited and specific educative functions to perform rather than political. Individuals who staff positions in these agencies are generally disassociated from the community, often by class lines or as "outsiders," and they are often specifically prohibited from dealing with community "politics." These governmental agencies are extralocal in origin, operating upon, not within, the local situation, and therefore their contact with the community is, in the main, only tangential to the prevailing normative patterns. To be sure, there have been a number of instances in recent years of "outsiders" attempting to disrupt the local balance of power; but by and large these efforts have met with stubborn and, generally speaking, successful resistance by local residents and community political leaders.

Communication, then, between urban America and rural mountain communities through the political institution is probably not as influential in bringing about sociocultural integration as one might suppose or as some might wish. During state and national election years, however, when the power of rural mountain votes attracts considerable attention, American political leaders manifest a desire for closer and more influential linkage. If one looks at the voting record of Appalachian counties, for example, whether mining or agricultural counties (but especially the agricultural counties) one is startled by the consistency of party loyalty regardless of national political personalities, national issues, and variations in party position affecting the economic interests of mountain communities[22]. Occasionally, as in the recent election, certain emotional issues may sway party loyalties, but over the long haul, because of relative isolation and strong familistic norms, voting behavior is far more predictable in mountain counties than in urban America.

Economic contact between urban America and the rural agricultural communities of Appalachia is mainly through the social mechanism of the market place and its supportive agencies. The traditional system of structurally isolated farm firms, with its industrial fragmentation in terms of decision making and spatial concentration, is a natural barrier, or gap, to effective intracommunication within the industry. Lines of communicaton from the urban sector to farm production units do not have a central community target, are therefore easily rejected, are more easily ignored, and are often in the form of mass media that are lost in the interest world of a familistically oriented agricultural community.

A major economic contact, then, between the inner and outer systems is at the point of exchange of goods and commodities, that is, the distribution sphere of economic activity. The market place, geared to the contractual patterns of a money economy, functions as a direct linkage of American Society with the rural community. However, this linkage is influential in causing an integration of these sociocultural systems only when it involves the expenditure of much time by individuals in the contact situation, a large turnover of goods and commodities, and, more important, the necessity of making choices and planning specific marketing strategy. (This is, of course, one reason why the process of the diffusion of agricultural information has receiv-

ed so much research attention by rural sociologists in recent years.) In the low-income farming counties of Appalachia with their subsistencelike orientation to economic activity, the market place linkage, in effect, is not influential in welding together the inner with the outer world. Appalachian folk in their day-to-day decisions concerning the production and distribution of commodities tend to operate in conformance with traditional normative patterns. It may well be that, in large measure, this orientation is a reason for the so-called problem of "agricultural adjustment" of this and similar low-income rural areas. Professor Galbraith's discussion of "affluent" and "insular" societies is to the point here[23].

In recent years, an increasingly important economic linkage between the agricultural sector of this region and urban America has been in the form of "transfer payments," that is, payments made to individuals by governmental agencies such as social security, pensions, unemployment insurance, workman's compensation, and the like. Transfer payments amount to a sizeable proportion of the personal income coming into these Appalachian communities.[24] What is significant about this form of economic linkage is that its influence does not penetrate deeply into the sociocultural core of rural community life. Transfer payments and similar programs provide people with the means necessary for pursuing traditional goals, but their influence on the normative structure of the local rural community is, for the most part, negligible.

In many Appalachian communities, of course, coal mining is dominant and farming secondary. The structure of the contact situation between the inner and outer economic systems is quite different in these mining communities. Mining is a more centrally organized industry, with larger production units and more intercommunication between these production units. In terms of the labor market, the stream of migration has been, until recently, into these communities rather than out, as in the farming communities. Cultural diversity has been absorbed by the mining communities rather than drained away, and this has fostered internal change in their social structure, making them less familistic and more like that of urban America. As an occupational activity, mining is separated from the kinship structure in the specific sense of how the enterprise is organized; the miner, for example, is not self-employed and his wife does not perform specific work roles in the enterprise. Futhermore, there have been the unions, a direct organized, intensive, and highly influential linkage with the outside. In comparison with the agricultural communities, the mining communities are, in many respects, more closely linked with the national culture.[25] Nevertheless, at the present time, as coal mining communities are faced with economic crises and as they have become places to leave rather than, as was true in the early days, pockets of economic opportunity, many of the built-in linkages have been severed and many of the ties with urban America broken. A tragedy of our contemporary era is that the forces of modernization, which were never really adequately tapped, were pushed further back by economic circumstances confronting coal communities today.

The structure of the contact situation between the outer and inner educational systems is next in line for our attention. As an institution the school is structurally central in the sociocultural fabric of rural community life acting within, as well as upon the local milieu. In recent years the consolidated school, probably more than any other organization, has become the focus of these relatively isolated rural communities. Interschool rivalry in athletics, for example, has taken on great symbolic value and provided a means for reinforcing community identification. Along with this general interest in the public education system, an ever-increasing amount of community economic resources is being allocated to the local school. Education, as a "thing to get," is sanctioned by the mores and folkways of rural society, and like their urban counterparts, rural people in Appalachia support the "forced-formula educational system." For example, in a recent survey of southern Appalachian people it was found that only 0.9 percent of the rural informants desired less than a high-school education for their sons, only 1.3 percent desired less than a high-school education for their daughters, 95.6 percent favored their sons going to college if they had the opportunity, and 91.8 percent, compared to a little over 93 percent of their urban counterparts, said they favored children being legally required to go to school until they are 16 years old even if they wanted to work.[26] Interest in education, as numerous studies have shown, is self-perpetuat-

ing;[7] that is, a strong belief in the value of education begets an even stronger belief in the value of education. In this sense, the school system is granted and ensured the power to change the social structure of the local community by its virtual monopoly over the formal, extra-familial socialization of the community's youth. Furthermore, American society (inclusive of Appalachia) has tended to turn over more and more socialization functions to the school. It seems likely that this is closely related to the societal need for more uniformity, or homogeneity in its citizens. Indeed, the demand for conformity in school programs may be partly interpreted as due to the necessity for citizens to be, so to speak, interchangeable parts of a gigantic social machine as they move about freely within the nation. Since it is not only an integral part of the local social system, supported by community sentiment, but also tied into, indeed a part of, the educational system of the larger society, the school is a natural and strategic center for the diffusion of urban or urbanizing norms.

When a young person enters the school system, his basic orientations and behavior, learned in the primary group atmosphere of family, kin and neighborhood are exposed to the influence of a different environment. For though Appalachian communities tend to be familistically organized, the local school system tends, in some degree, to reflect the contractual-type norms of urban America. Grade school retains many of the more personal, communal characteristics of the primary group, functioning as a sort of transition "buffer." High school is the big step. The young person becomes submerged in a microcosm of the adult occupational world. Under the expedient pressure of large classes and varied curriculums. teachers must treat their pupils more formally. Marks become the criteria of success, at least in the formal structure of the school, and competition becomes an expected fact of life. In a framework of universalistic achievement standards, social skills are learned and practiced through school organizations, classroom procedures, and everyday contact with peers, teachers and administrators. The school, by teaching the normative patterns of urban America, inculcates the youngster with the culture of the larger society and through the processes of assimilation and substitution, furnishes him with a cultural link with the larger society, allowing him to become an agent of change in the rural community or to make an easier adjustment to urban life if he migrates.

Rural community institutions, however, are staffed largely by middle-class-oriented personnel who operate the bureaucratic structures of society. In the case of the school system, this is true, to some degree, even in the extremely isolated rural areas of Appalachia. Teachers are trained in colleges that emphasize urban-contractual norms, at least more so than in their familistic community setting, and the "high priests" of education have left their mark on the evaluative thought processes of their trainees. These modes of thinking and the resultant framework of expectations influence the content and the more or less standardized curriculums of the local school system. State regulations, which compel all school-age persons to attend school, also determine the requirements, in general, for hiring teachers on the local level. Furthermore, these teachers rely on textbooks usually written by middle-class-oriented "outsiders" reflecting values, beliefs, and sentiments that are more characteristic of urban society than of the rural familistic community. It should be noted, however, that a large proportion of teachers in Appalachian schools, because of comparatively low salary levels and generally unattractive school and community amenities, are natives of the region whose early socialization stems from the familistic sociocultural environment. This makes them "insiders" strategically placed in the local situation, where, though acceptable, they function as advocates of change.[8]

The educational institution then, as we have tried to show, because of its structurally strategic position, functions as a major cultural bridge between the relatively isolated mountain communities of Appalachia and the larger American Society of which these communities are a part and to which these communities belong. The other major institutional systems are more insulated and have less direct, less strong, and less continuous lines of communication into the mountain region from the rest of American society. One concludes that the educational institution is much more important than the non-educational institutions in bringing about a sociocultural integration of rural Appalachian communities and urban America. Indeed, one might say that educaton is an effective and effi-

cient force stimulating the processes of modernization in relatively isolated mountain communities.[7] For the major institutions are interdependent and interrelated; that is, they are parts of a sociocultural system composing the local community, and changes introduced through one institution will, in time, bring about significant changes in the others.

For example, in recent years the isolation of Appalachian communities has been breaking down and along with it the family's monopoly over socialization of the young. The notable development of the public school system in the past thirty years has been perhaps the most important single factor contributing to this breakdown, although in other places, in other times, the increasing linkage with urban America coming as a result of the development of lumbering, mining, roads, migration, and so on, may have been equally, or even more, important. In the case of Appalachia, however, the evidence available strongly indicates that education, mainly through the local school system but also through specialized agencies such as the Extension Service which are charged with the function of promoting the continued education of the adult population, has been, in recent history, and is, in the contemporary situation, a major integrative link with modern, rapdly changing, American Society.

In conclusion, let us suggest two main, and perhaps obvious, inferences from our analysis of community structures and institutional channels for change in the Appalachian Region. It seems clear, given the sociocultural circumstances that characterize Appalachian communities, that the development of a strong, modern school system in the relatively isolated rural areas of this region will, in the long run, pay rich dividends in terms of binding these communities and their people — whether they remain in Appalachia or whether they choose to migrate to regions offering greater economic opportunity— into the mainstream of American Society.[8] The educational system, which is directly linked with urban America and strategically located within the fabric of community life, can perform this task quite efficiently; the system of religious organizations, for example, and the other institutional sectors of Appalachian communities, for reasons we have mentioned, can not.

It is our hypothesis that the school system brings about great changes in general orientations of young people, and that these changes set the stage for changes in specific orientations, both educational and noneducational. Furthermore, with time and under certain conditions, these changes in orientation will effect changes in the institutional structure of the region and in the very fabric of neigborhood and community life. We believe, therefore, that a heavy investment of societal resources in the educational institutions of Appalachia, particularly at the elementary and secondary school levels, would prove to be, in the long run, one of the more effective (and efficient) strategies within our means for securing the well-being of the Appalachian people.

It also seems clear that agencies, such as the Extension Service or Programs of Adult Education, which are charged with promoting the continued education of the adult population, and organizations, such as the Community College System and Teacher Training Schools, which inevitably produce the community leaders of the future, should be cognizant of the supportive part they play in strengthening the linkages between rural Appalachian communities and modern, urban America. For, at this time and in this region, the key that will eventually unlock the door of provincialism and apathy which has so long barred the forces of modernization and change from entree into the mountain communities, is, as we see it, a strong system of education at the local level.

FOOTNOTES

1. This is a revised version of a paper read at the Extension Leaders Conference, Morgantown, West Virginia. November, 1968. It is based upon an earlier paper: Harry K. Schwarzweller and James S. Brown, "Education as a Cultural Bridge between Eastern Kentucky and the Great Society," *Rural Sociology*, 27 (December, 1962), pp. 357-373. Although we have attempted to take into account some of the contemporary developments within the region and to up-date our thinking in the light of recent research — our own as well as that by other students of the changing Appalachian society — most of the basic notions we formulated during the pleasant summer of 1962 in Lexington, Kentucky seem, even today, to be quite useful and valid. For this reason especially we feel that our ideas and perspectives should be considered and evaluated by a wider audience and in particular by those who are engaged in the difficult tasks of implementing change programs at the local level.
2. See John Photiadis, *Rural Southern Appalachia and Mass Society, An Overview*, Office of Research and Development, Center for Appalachian Studies and Development, West Virginia University; Thomas R. Ford, editor, *The Southern Appalachian Regions A Survey*, University of Kentucky Press, 1962; E. A. Wilkening, "Some Perspectives on Change in Rural Societies," *Rural Sociologye*, 29 (March, 1964), pp. 1-17.
3. Our theoretical perspective here is based upon an equalibrium model. See Talcott Parsons, "Some Considerations in the Theory of Social Change," *Rural Sociology*, 26 (September, 1961), pp. 219-239; Talcott Parsons, *The Social System*, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1951.
4. It should be noted, however, that actually nearly twice as many persons are employed in manufacturing as in mining and agriculture together. Indeed, the industrial composition of the Appalachian Region in 1960 was remarkably similar to that of the United States as a whole, with a higher percentage in mining and a slightly higher proportion in agriculture being the principal differences. But such overall regional data obscure very important differences which exist within the region; for example, 18 percent of Appalachian Kentucky's employed persons and 14 percent of Appalachian West Virginia's are in mining compared with only one percent of the United States' population. And of course "manufacturing" in the Appalachians and in the United States as a whole often are very different kinds of industry, most of the Appalachians being light, secondary types instead of heavy, finishing sorts of industries. Hence, what we mean is that the "tone" of the Appalachian economy tends to be set by, i.e., "dominated" by, the extractive industries.

   For a discussion of the industrial composition of Appalachian Society, see James S. Brown, "Population and Migration Changes in Appalachia," (mimeo) paper prepared for Rural Appalachia in Transition Conference, Morgantown, West Virginia, October 1967, pp. 42-45.
5. In 1960, 7.6 percent of the United States labor force was employed in agriculture and mining compared with 14.9 percent in the Southern Appalachian Region, 18.0 percent in Appalachian West Virginia (excluding the Wheeling area), and 29.0 percent in Appalachian Kentucky. See *ibid.*' p. 43.
6. See, for example, the research reports by Ralph J. Ramsey, *Forms and Scope of Poverty in Kentucky*, Research Development Series No. 10, Universitey of Kentucky Cooperative Extension Service; and Cyrus Johnson, *Mountain Families in Poverty*, Department of Sociology, RS-24, University of Kentucky, 1965.

   In 1959, the median family income for the United States as a whole was $5,660 whereas for the Southern Appalachian Region it was $3,882, for Appalachian Kentucky it was $2,609, and for Appalachian West Virginia it was $4,352 (the highest for any state in the region). See *ibid.*' p. 41. Furthermore, it should be noted that during the same period only 21 per cent of the U.S. families had incomes less than $3000 compared with 35 percent in West Virginia and 56 percent in Appalachian Kentucky.
7. In terms of the occupational structure of Appalachia, for example, during the decade 1950-60 the number of persons employed in agriculture decreased 55 percent and the number in mining decreased 52 percent. On the other hand the number in manufacturing increased 24 percent and the number in communications, utilities, and service increased 24 percent. See *ibid.*, p. 42.
8. Although we shall stress primarily the effect of urban American traits upon the isolated subsociety, this flow of influence is not a one-sided affair. For instance, the well-known Kentucky mountain author Jessie Stuart, educated in the school system of the southern Appalachians, was greatly affected by the value orientations of urban America; he, in turn, from his experiences in eastern Kentucky, not the least significant of which was the impact of mountain culture upon his thought, wrote a book on school teaching called *The Thread That Runs so True*, (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1949) which, judging from its popularity and wide use in educational circles, has had some influence on urban America's educational orientations. Indeed, Appalachia can point with great pride to its contributions to American society's folk songs, folk dances and folklore.
9. Emile Durkheim, *Education and Sociology*, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1956.
10. Numerous writers have offered theoretical support to this contention. See, for example, Robert E. Park, "Education and the Cultural Crises," *American Journal of Sociology*, XLVIII (1943), p. 730; Bromisleaw Malinowski, "The Pan African Problem of Culture Contact," *American Journal of Sociology*, XLVIII (1943), p. 652.
11. See Charles P. Loomis, "Toward a Theory of Systemic Social Change," in North Central Regional Rural Sociology Committee, *Rural Sociology in a Changing Society*, Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station, 1960, pp. 12-48.
12. The distinction between the educational institution and educational aspects of other institutions should be borne in mind. We are talking about "structural linkage" and how this facilitates or poses a barrier to "communication" (i.e., education in the broad sense). Our assumption is that unless the linkage is strong and integral to the mountain way of life, communication from the outside will be weak and relatively ineffective in fostering basic changes in attitudes and values.

13. Pitirim A. Sorokin, Carle C. Zimmerman, and Charles J. Galpin, *A Systematic Source Book in Rural Sociology*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1931, p. 41.
14. See James S. Brown, *The Family Group in a Kentucky Mountain Farming Community*, University of Kentucky Agric. Exp. Sta. Bull. 588, Lexington, 1952.
15. James N. Young and Ward W. Bauder, *Membership Characteristics of Special-Interest Organizations*, University of Kentucky Agr. Exp. Sta. Bull. 594, Lexington, 1953; see also Harold F. Kaufman, *Participation in Organized Activities in Selected Kentucky Localities*, University of Kentucky Agr. Exp. Sta. Bull. 528, Lexington, 1949.
16. H. H. Remmers, "Early Socialization of Attitudes," in Eugene Burdick and Arthur J. Brodbeck, eds., *American Voting Behavior*, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1959, p. 61.
17. Cyrus M. Johnson, A. Lee Coleman and William B. Clifford, *Mountain Families in Poverty*, Lexington: University of Kentucky Department of Sociology, RS-29, (May, 1967), pp. 76-78.
18. See, for example, James S. Brown, Harry K. Schwarzweller, and Joseph J. Mangalam, "Kentucky Mountain Migration and the Stem-Family: An American Variation on a theme by LePlay," *Rural Sociology*, 28 (March, 1963), p. 66.
19. This generalization is derived from our own study of a relatively isolated mountain neighborhood. The findings from The Beech Creek Study will be reported in a forthcoming book.
20. See, for example, Harold F. Kaufman, *Rural Churches in Kentucky*, 1947, University of Kentucky Agri. Exp. Sta. Bull. 530, Lexington, 1949.
21. Familistic norms tend to permeate the functioning of the local political structure in many ways, and the organization of the state in these communities, to use the words of Williams, tends to "be a sort of film on the surface of the society failing to penetrate directly to the mass of individuals." See Robin Williams, *American Society*, 2nd ed., New York: Knopf, 1960, p. 493.
22. Schwarzweller and Brown, *op. cit.* p. 364.
23. John K. Galbraith, *The Affluent Society*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1958.
24. For example, transfer payments amounted to 12.7 percent of the personal income of eastern Kentucky people in 1957. Eight counties in this region had payments amounting to 20.3 to 27.5 percent of the personal income of these counties. See Mildred Hubbard, *Personal Income in Kentucky Counties* 1957, Lexington: University of Kentucky, Bureau of Business Research Publication, June, 1958, Table 4.
25. In some other respects, however, mining tends to be a family affair, and a way of life with distinctively "rural" qualities. Mining camps, for example, tend to be small, relatively isolated communities and these communities tend to be relatively homogeneous with respect to status differentials; kin-visiting and neighboring tend to be more important social activities; the work situation tends to be organized on a personalistic basis and men are governed by particularistic norms; and the mine management tends to be paternalistic in its dealings with the workers, their families and the mine community.
26. These data are from the 1960 Southern Appalachian Survey and are on file at Berea College and at the Sociology Department, University of Kentucky (Professor Thomas R. Ford).
27. Everett M. Rogers, *Social Change in Rural Society*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1960, pp. 241-242.
28. A recent study of an eastern Kentucky coal-mining county by Dudley Plunkett, a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Chicago under the direction of Professor C. A. Anderson of the Sociology Department, found that this tendency is less so than we had anticipated. Indeed, in the more isolated areas of the county, where the need to bridge the gap between the inner and outer worlds is extremely urgent, school teachers tend to be local people who not only reflect but advocate local norms. One cannot help comparing this situation with that of the school systems in relatively isolated, mountain communities of Europe where, as in Germany for example, teachers are invariably from outside the local area (perhaps because salaries are standardized and teachers are hired by the State, not the community) and, consequently, function as advocates of "modern" ideas and contemporary trends.
29. This, of course, is not a new idea. Numerous writers have offered theoretical support to our contention. See, for example, Robert E. Park, "Education and the Cultural Crises," *American Joural of Sociology*, 48 (1943), p. 730; Bronislaw Malinowski, "The Pan-African Problem of Culture Contact," *American Journal of Sociology*, 48 (1943), p. 652.
30. Some, of course, will deplore the passing of the old. And in certain respects, so shall we. But let us keep in mind that American Society is after all pluralistic, not a homogeneous collectivity; there is more than one America. The tightening web of interdependency that is concomitant with modernization by no means suggests that Appalachia must be destroyed as a cultural entity. Likewise, increased complexity and fragmentation of the Appalachian social structure, and increased specificity of person to person relationships, does not mean necessarily that the individual in Appalachia, as a social being, must reconcile himself to becoming lost in the larger mass. To the contrary, it can mean greater opportunity, greater freedom for the individual to express himself as a human being.